REMARKS

Independent Claims 2, 37 and 48

Independent claims 2, 37 and 48 are rejected over Beauregard in view of Eide. These rejections should be withdrawn, because the claims recite limitations that are lacking in the references. These limitations relate to processing a command, being entered by a user, BEFORE the ENTIRE command is received.

Specifically, claim 2 recites displaying a list of probable commands "**while** receiving the abbreviated textual command" being entered by the user. Similarly, claim 37 recites comparing and determining probable commands "**before** receiving the entire abbreviated textual command" being entered by the user. Similarly, claim 48 recites comparing and determining probable commands "**while** receiving the text string" being entered by the user."

These limitations are exemplified in the application by a user entering "e_j", which could be an abbreviation for the complete commands of "email john" and "email jane".[1] WHILE receiving the abbreviated command, the system performs the command-determining step to display a list of probable commands. The user can select a command from the list or continue entering text by continuing typing.[2] The list of probable commands is thus displayed without the user having entered a delimiter indicating an end to text entry.

The cited references teach away from these limitations by processing a text command only AFTER the user enters a delimiter to indicate an end to text entry. In Beauregard, the delimiter is a double-space (col. 9, line 9). In Eide, the delimiter is a Return key (p.37, 2nd par.) or an Escape (p.37, 4th par.). Therefore, claims 2, 37 and 48 are patentable over the cited prior art.

---

[1] application, p. 6, lines 20-21

[2] application, p. 8, lines 1-4; p. 9, line 17

New Independent Claim 51

New claim 51 recites a search engine that, in response to determining that a text string entered by a user does not match any command in a command database, will display a list of generic commands for the user to select from.

This limitation, of displaying a list of generic commands that don't match the entered command, is supported in the application at p. 8, lines 8-11, but not disclosed in the prior art of record. Therefore, claim 51 is patentable over the prior art of record.

New Independent Claim 52

New claim 52 recites a search engine that receives a text string entered by a user while the user is in a first application, then compares the text string to commands in a database to determine a match with a command to open a second application, and then initiates the second application.

This limitation, of a user launching a second application from within a first application by entering a text command within the first application, is supported in the application at p. 4, lines 15-19. But it is not disclosed in the prior art of record. Therefore, claim 52 is patentable over the prior art of record.

New Independent Claim 54

New claim 54 recites a search engine that executes a command that is chosen based on that command's probability of being desired by the user being above a threshold, despite the probability being less than 1, and without the search engine bothering to determine the probability that another command might be desired.

This limitation is supported in the application at p. 6, lines 4-8; and p. 7, lines 4-6 and 18-21, but not disclosed in the prior art of record. Therefore, claim 54 is patentable over the prior art of record.

New Independent Claim 56

New claim 56 recites displaying a list of frequently used commands "as soon as the user begins entering the command text string". This limitation is supported in the application at p. 9, lines 14-17, but is not disclosed by the prior art of record. Therefore, claim 56 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Dependent Claims 3-13, 38-45, 49-50, 53 and 55

The remaining claims all depend from base claims that are explained above to be patentable over the prior art. The limitations that the dependent claims add to the base claims distinguish them further from the prior art. Therefore, the dependent claims, also, are patentable.

The application is therefore now in condition for allowance, and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell Rose

Mitchell Rose (Reg. No. 47,906)
JONES DAY
901 Lakeside Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44114
Date: 2/28/08   (216)586-7094